

1 **MAYER BROWN LLP**
2 DALE J. GIALI (SBN 150382)
3 *dgiali@mayerbrown.com*
4 KERI E. BORDERS (SBN 194015)
5 *kborders@mayerbrown.com*
6 350 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
7 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1503
8 Telephone: (213) 229-9500
9 Facsimile: (213) 625-0248

10 **DECHERT LLP**
11 HOPE FREIWALD (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
12 *hope.freiwald@dechert.com*
13 2929 Arch Street,
14 Philadelphia, PA 19104-2808
15 Telephone: (215) 994-4000
16 Facsimile: (215) 994-2222
17 MARK CHEFFO (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
18 *mark.cheffo@dechert.com*
19 1095 Avenue of the Americas,
20 New York, NY, 10036-6797
21 Telephone: (212) 698-3500
22 Facsimile: (212) 994-3599

23 Attorneys for Defendants PLUM, PBC,
24 (erroneously sued as PLUM, INC.) and
25 CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

18 LUDMILA GULKAROV, JANINE
19 TORRENCE, KELLY MCKEON and
20 JOSH CRAWFORD, individually and on
21 behalf of all others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 PLUM, PBC, and PLUM, INC.,
25 Delaware corporations,

26 Defendants.

27 Case No. 4:21-cv-00913-YGR

28 Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

1 **DEFENDANTS PLUM, PBC AND**
2 **CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY'S NOTICE**
3 **OF MOTION AND MOTION TO TRANSFER**
4 **THESE RELATED CASES TO THE UNITED**
5 **STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF**
6 **NEW JERSEY; MEMORANDUM OF**
7 **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

1 *[Declaration of Keely J. Stewart and*
2 *[Proposed] Order filed concurrently*
3 *herewith]*

4 Date: May 18, 2021
5 Time: 3:30 p.m.
6 Courtroom: 1

VANESSA MATHIESEN, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Case No. 4:21-cv-01763-YGR

Plaintiff,

V.

PLUM, PBC,

Defendant.

CINDY PEREIRA, on behalf of herself and a class of others similarly situated,

Case No. 4:21-cv-01767-YGR

Plaintiff,

V.

CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY, and PLUM,
PBC,

Defendants.

AUTUMN ELLISON, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Case No. 4:21-cv-02015-YGR

Plaintiff,

V.

PLUM, PBC, and PLUM, INC., Delaware corporations.

Defendants

JESSICA DAVID and HEATHER AGE,
individually, and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Case No. 3:21-cv-02059-AGT

Plaintiff.

V.

PLUM, PBC.; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive.

Defendants.

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE THAT NOTICE** that on May 18, 2021 at 3:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as
 3 the matter may be heard, in Courtroom 1, 4th Floor, of this Court, located at 1301 Clay Street,
 4 Oakland, CA 94612, before the Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, defendants Plum, PBC
 5 (also erroneously sued as Plum, Inc.)¹ and Campbell Soup Company (collectively, “Defendants”)
 6 will and hereby do respectfully move the Court for an order transferring the following related
 7 cases to the United States District Court, District of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1404(a):

- 8 • *Gulkarov v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv913 (N.D. Cal.)
- 9 • *Mathiesen v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv1763 (N.D. Cal.)
- 10 • *Pereira v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 4:21cv1767 (N.D. Cal.)
- 11 • *Ellison v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv2015 (N.D. Cal.)
- 12 • *David v. Plum, PBC*, No. 3:21cv2059 (N.D. Cal.)

13 Good cause exists to grant this motion. Defendants are headquartered in New Jersey and,
 14 accordingly, plaintiffs could have brought their claims in the District of New Jersey in the first
 15 instance. Moreover, the balance of relevant factors, including the convenience of the parties and
 16 witnesses, the conservation of judicial resources, and the interests of justice, favor transferring
 17 these actions to New Jersey.

18 This motion is based upon this notice of motion and motion, the attached memorandum
 19 of points and authorities in support, the concurrently filed declaration of Keely J. Stewart, the
 20 pleadings and papers on file in these actions and other similar actions against these Defendants,
 21 and upon such other oral argument and/or documentary matters as may be presented to the Court
 22 at or before the hearing on this motion.

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

¹ In 2013, Plum, Inc. was converted into a public benefit corporation and was renamed Plum,
 PBC. Accordingly, Plum, Inc. no longer exists.

1 Dated: April 12, 2021

2
3 MAYER BROWN LLP
Dale J. Giali
Keri E. Borders

4 DECHERT LLP
Hope Friewald
Mark Cheffo

5
6 by: /s/ Keri E. Borders
7 Keri E. Borders

8 Attorneys for Defendants
9 Plum, PBC and Campbell Soup Company

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), should these related cases be transferred to the United States District Court, District of New Jersey?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The Related Class Actions Against Plum And Campbell.....	3
B. Defendants Are Located In New Jersey.....	5
III. THE N.D. CAL. CASES SHOULD BE TRANSFERRED TO NEW JERSEY	5
A. The N.D. Cal. Cases “Could Have Been Brought” In New Jersey.....	6
B. Convenience And Fairness Factors Weigh In Favor Of Transfer.....	7
C. Transfer Would Serve The Interests Of Justice	9
IV. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alesia v. Gojo Industries, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 6826475 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2020).....	11, 12
<i>Alexander v. Franklin Res., Inc.</i> , 2007 WL 518859 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2007)	8, 10
<i>In re Baby Food Marketing, Sales, Practices and Products Liability Litig.</i> , MDL No. 2997.....	5
<i>Benjamin v. Bixby</i> , 2009 WL 2171781 (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2009)	11
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Sup. Ct.</i> , 137 S. Ct 1773 (2017).....	11
<i>Burns v. Gerber Prods. Co.</i> , 922 F. Supp. 2d 1168 (E.D. Wash. 2013).....	2, 9, 12
<i>Daimler AG v. Bauman</i> , 571 U.S. 117 (2014).....	7, 11
<i>Fraser v. Genesco, Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 4566312 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2011).....	8, 10
<i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown</i> , 564 U.S. 915 (2011).....	7
<i>Hawkins v. Gerber Prods. Co.</i> , 924 F. Supp. 2d 1208 (S.D. Cal. 2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Hoffman v. Blaski</i> , 363 U.S. 335 (1960).....	6
<i>In R.A. v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 6792801 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2019).....	9
<i>Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.</i> , 211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000)	10
<i>Jovel v. i-Health, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 5470057 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2012).....	8
<i>Knoll, Inc. v. Modway, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 6784346 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2020).....	7, 10

1	<i>Koster v. (Am.) Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co.,</i> 330 U.S. 518 (1947).....	10
2	<i>Lou v. Belzberg,</i> 834 F.2d 730 (9th Cir. 1987)	10
3		
4	<i>Metz v. U.S. Life Ins. Co. in City of New York,</i> 674 F. Supp. 2d 1141 (C.D. Cal. 2009)	7
5		
6	<i>Puri v. Hearthside Food Sols, LLC,</i> 2011 WL 6257182 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2011)	9, 10
7		
8	<i>SA Music, LLC v. Apple, Inc.,</i> 2020 WL 8028613 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020).....	7, 10
9		
10	<i>Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp.,</i> 487 U.S. 22 (1988).....	6
11		
12	<i>Sugarman v. Muddy Waters Cap. LLC,</i> 2021 WL 583220 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2021)	9
13		
14	<i>Van Dusen v. Barrack,</i> 376 U.S. 612 (1964).....	6
15		
16	<i>Ventress v. Japan Airlines,</i> 486 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2007)	6
17		
18	<i>Walden v. Fiore,</i> 571 U.S. 277 (2014).....	11
19		
20	<i>Wallace v. Int'l Paper Co.,</i> 2020 WL 4938361 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2020).....	11
21		
22	<i>Wallerstein v. Dole Fresh Vegetables, Inc.,</i> 967 F. Supp. 2d 1289 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	6
23		
24	<i>Walters v. Famous Transports, Inc.,</i> 488 F. Supp. 3d 930 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....	10
25		
26	<i>In re Yahoo! Inc.,</i> 2008 WL 707405 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2008).....	12
27		
28	Statutes	
29	28 U.S.C. 1332.....	7
30		
31	28 U.S.C. § 1391.....	7
32		
33	28 U.S.C. §1404.....	2, 5, 6, 10
34		

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendants Plum, PBC (also erroneously sued as Plum, Inc.) (“Plum”) and its parent
 3 company, Campbell Soup Company (“Campbell”) (collectively, “Defendants”), are defendants
 4 in five nationwide consumer class actions pending in this Court and alleging false advertising
 5 regarding Plum’s baby food products:

6 • *Gulkarov v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv913 (N.D. Cal.)
 7 • *Mathiesen v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv1763 (N.D. Cal.)
 8 • *Pereira v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 4:21cv1767 (N.D. Cal.)
 9 • *Ellison v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv2015 (N.D. Cal.)
 10 • *David v. Plum, PBC*, No. 3:21cv2059 (N.D. Cal.)

11 (collectively, the “N.D. Cal. Cases.”) Plum and Campbell are also defendants in four materially
 12 identical nationwide consumer class actions pending in the District of New Jersey before the
 13 same judge (Judge Noel Hillman) as related cases:

14 • *Smid v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 1:21cv2417 (D.N.J.)
 15 • *Chase v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 1:21cv4650 (D.N.J.)
 16 • *Baccari v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 1:21cv4749 (D.N.J.)
 17 • *E. Smith v. Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 1:21cv8567 (D.N.J.)

18 All nine of these cases arise out of, and were filed shortly after, a February 4, 2021 report
 19 issued by the House Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy (the “House
 20 Subcommittee Report”), which purported to find that many popular baby and toddler foods
 21 possibly contained excessive levels of heavy metals, including arsenic, cadmium, lead, and
 22 mercury. Within 24 hours of the release of the House Subcommittee Report, plaintiffs began
 23 filing class action lawsuits across the country against major baby food manufacturers, including
 24 Defendants.²

25 _____
 26 ² FDA responded to the House Subcommittee Report by reassuring the public that “FDA’s
 27 testing shows that children are not at an immediate health risk from exposure to toxic elements at
 28 the levels found in foods” and by announcing an action plan entitled “Closer To Zero” to
 evaluate and propose action levels for heavy metals in baby food. See https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-releases-action-plan-reducing-exposure-toxic-elements-foods-babies-young-children?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery.

1 The N.D. Cal. Cases are in the process of being consolidated into a single action.
 2 Simultaneously, plaintiffs in the nationwide class actions filed in the District of New Jersey are
 3 also in the process of consolidating those cases into a single action. While these consolidation
 4 efforts are warranted and appropriate, it nevertheless remains highly inefficient, including a
 5 waste of the parties and the Court's time and resources, to simultaneously litigate materially
 6 identical cases involving the same claims and the same putative classes, in more than one court.

7 Significantly, while transfer motions usually raise a binary question – *i.e.*, the case will
 8 proceed either here *or* there – this motion raises the different question whether the same
 9 consumer class action should be pending here *and* there. The answer, of course, is no. *Hawkins*
 10 *v. Gerber Prods. Co.*, 924 F. Supp. 2d 1208, 1213 (S.D. Cal. 2013) (transfer granted; “this
 11 transfer motion is unlike the typical binary ‘either-or’ transfer motion, because the . . . [New
 12 Jersey] action will continue in New Jersey regardless the outcome of this transfer motion”);
 13 *Burns v. Gerber Prods. Co.*, 922 F. Supp. 2d 1168, 1170-71 (E.D. Wash. 2013) (transfer granted;
 14 motion was not “the typical binary ‘either-or’ transfer motion” because the issue was whether the
 15 case should be consolidated with another pending consolidated class action suit “asserting near-
 16 identical claims” in defendant’s preferred forum).

17 Accordingly, Defendants bring this motion to transfer the N.D. Cal. Cases to the District
 18 of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1404(a). The convenience of the witnesses and access to
 19 evidence, and the interests of efficiency and justice favor transfer to New Jersey. Transfer to
 20 New Jersey – instead of transferring the New Jersey cases to this Court – is necessary and
 21 appropriate because all of the cases may be properly venued in New Jersey, but many of the
 22 cases, including several of the N.D. Cal. Cases, are not amenable to proceeding in the Northern
 23 District of California due to jurisdictional and venue problems. That’s largely because, as
 24 discussed below, the Court lacks general jurisdiction over Defendants such that it could
 25 adjudicate claims brought by non-California plaintiffs (and the non-California putative class
 26 members). For these reasons, and as more fully detailed below, the motion to transfer the N.D.
 27 Cal. Cases to the District of New Jersey should be granted.

28

1 **II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

2 **A. The Related Class Actions Against Plum And Campbell**

3 *N.D. Cal. Cases.* Currently, there are five related nationwide class actions pending
 4 against defendants Plum and Campbell in the Northern District of California that are the subject
 5 of this motion to transfer.³

6 1. *Gulkarov, et al. v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv913 (N.D. Cal.). Plaintiffs are citizens
 7 of California, New York, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania. They seek to represent a putative
 8 nationwide class of consumers, as well as California, New York, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania
 9 sub-classes.

10 2. *Mathiesen v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv1763 (N.D. Cal.). Plaintiff is a citizen of
 11 California and seeks to represent a putative nationwide class of consumers, as well as a
 12 California sub-class.

13 3. *Pereira v. Plum, PBC and Campbell Soup Co.*, No. 4:21cv1767 (N.D. Cal.).
 14 Plaintiff is a citizen of California and seeks to represent a putative nationwide class of
 15 consumers, as well as a California Sub-class.

16 4. *Ellison v. Plum, PBC*, No. 4:21cv2015 (N.D. Cal.). Plaintiff is citizen of Oregon
 17 and seeks to represent a putative nationwide class of consumers, as well as an Oregon sub-class.

18 5. *David, et al. v. Plum, PBC*, No. 3:21cv2059 (N.D. Cal.). Plaintiffs are citizens of
 19 Florida and Kentucky and seek to represent a putative nationwide class of consumers, as well as
 20 Florida and Kentucky sub-classes. An administrative motion to relate this case to the others is
 21 pending.

22 On April 6, 2021, the plaintiffs in *Gulkarov*, *Mathiesen*, *Pereira*, and *Ellison* filed a
 23 “stipulation” to consolidate those cases (Nos. 1-4 above) into a single action. *See, e.g., Gulkarov*,
 24 ECF Nos. 29, 30, 31. The *David* case was not included in that filing, even though it is a
 25 materially identical class action. On April 7, 2021, the *David* plaintiffs filed an administrative
 26 motion to relate *David* to *Gulkarov*. *Gulkarov*, ECF No. 32. As evidenced by these filings,

27 28 ³ An additional class action was filed in this Court on April 7, 2021, *L. Smith v. Plum, PBC, et al.*, No. 3:21cv2519 (N.D. Cal.). That case is against multiple, additional defendants and, therefore, is not now the subject of this transfer motion.

1 plaintiffs agree that these cases are materially identical. And, on April 7, 2021, the Court ordered
 2 *Pereira, Ellison and Mathiesen* related to *Gulkarov. Id.*, ECF No. 33.

3 **New Jersey Cases.** Currently, there are four materially identical nationwide class actions
 4 pending against Plum and Campbell in the District of New Jersey. They are materially identical
 5 to each other and to the N.D. Cal. Cases. They have been deemed related and all are assigned to
 6 Judge Noel Hillman.

7 1. *Smid v. Campbell Soup Company and Plum, PBC*, No. 1:21cv2417 (D.N.J.).

8 Plaintiff is a citizen of Illinois and seeks to represent a putative nationwide class of consumers.

9 2. *Chase, et al. v. Campbell Soup Company and Plum, PBC*, No. 1:21cv4650
 10 (D.N.J.). Plaintiffs are citizens of South Carolina and seek to represent a putative nationwide
 11 class of consumers, as well as a South Carolina sub-class.

12 3. *Baccari, et al. v. Campbell Soup Company and Plum, PBC*, No. 1:21cv4749
 13 (D.N.J.). Plaintiffs are citizens of Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas and seek to
 14 represent a putative nationwide class of consumers, as well as Massachusetts, North Carolina,
 15 Ohio, and Texas sub-classes.

16 4. *E. Smith v. Campbell Soup Company and Plum, PBC*, No. 1:21cv8567 (D.N.J.).
 17 Plaintiff is a citizen of New Jersey and seeks to represent a putative nationwide class of
 18 consumers, as well as a New Jersey sub-class.

19 **MDL Petition.** Following release of the House Subcommittee Report, at least 84 class
 20 actions have been filed against baby food manufacturers, including Defendants, Gerber Products
 21 Company, Nurture, Inc., Hain Celestial Group, Inc., Beech-Nut Nutrition Company, and Sprout
 22 Foods, Inc. A petition was filed with the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to coordinate
 23 and transfer all of the federal consumer class actions arising out of the House Subcommittee
 24 Report under the multidistrict litigation procedures. *See In re Baby Food Marketing, Sales,
 25 Practices and Products Liability Litig.*, MDL No. 2997. In advance of the hearing on the
 26 petition, the JPML encouraged the parties to “pursue alternatives to centralization” and to report
 27 to the JPML on the parties’ efforts to coordinate by “seeking Section 1404 transfer of one or
 28 more of the subject cases.” *See id.*, ECF No. 3. Accordingly, and in addition to being supported

1 by traditional 1404 factors, Defendants' motion to transfer the N.D. Cal. Cases to New Jersey is
 2 in accord with the JPML's guidance. *See, e.g., Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1212 ("JPMDL []
 3 entered an order denying centralization of this case with the other similar lawsuits, explaining
 4 that 'transfer under Section 1404 is preferable to centralization'").

5 **B. Defendants Are Located In New Jersey**

6 Plum was at the time of filing and currently is a Delaware corporation with its principal
 7 place of business in Camden, New Jersey. Declaration of Keely J. Stewart ("Stewart Decl.") ¶¶
 8 3-4.⁴ Campbell is a New Jersey corporation with its principal place of business in Camden, New
 9 Jersey. *Id.* at ¶ 3.

10 Campbell acquired Plum in 2013 and it is a wholly owned, indirect subsidiary of
 11 Campbell. *Id.* at ¶ 4. At the time Campbell acquired Plum, Plum was a Delaware corporation,
 12 headquartered in Emeryville, California. *Id.* at ¶ 4. Subsequent to Campbell's acquisition, and
 13 more than two years before the N.D. Cal. Cases were filed, Plum moved its headquarters to
 14 Camden, New Jersey, the same location as Campbell. *Id.* at ¶ 4. The transfer of the entirety of
 15 Plum's operations to New Jersey was completed by 2018, and after that time, Plum maintained
 16 no headquarters, offices, or operations in California. *Id.* at ¶ 6.

17 **III. THE N.D. CAL. CASES SHOULD BE TRANSFERRED TO NEW JERSEY**

18 "For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court
 19 may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought . . ."
 20 28 U.S.C. §1404(a). A court has discretion to transfer an action pursuant to Section 1404 "to
 21 prevent the waste of time, energy and money and to protect litigants, witnesses and the public
 22 against unnecessary inconvenience and expense." *Van Dusen v. Barrack*, 376 U.S. 612, 616
 23 (1964) (quotations omitted); *see also Ventress v. Japan Airlines*, 486 F.3d 1111, 1118-19 (9th
 24 Cir. 2007) (affirming transfer from California to Hawaii); *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1212,
 25 1217 (transfer granted from California to New Jersey). Courts are "to adjudicate motions for
 26 transfer according to an individualized, case-by-case consideration of convenience and fairness."

27
 28 ⁴ On March 31, 2021, Campbell announced that it was selling Plum to Sun-Maid Growers of California. Stewart Decl. at ¶ 7. The transaction is expected to close in early May 2021.

1 *Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp.*, 487 U.S. 22, 29 (1988) (citation and quotations omitted);
 2 *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1212–13. All of the N.D. Cal. cases unquestionably could have been
 3 brought in the District of New Jersey, where Campbell and Plum have and do maintain their
 4 principal places of business. Significantly, the convenience of the parties and witnesses, the
 5 feasibility of consolidation with other cases, the fact that venue and jurisdiction is improper in
 6 many of the N.D. Cal. Cases, and the interests of justice heavily favor transfer to the District of
 7 New Jersey.⁵

8 **A. The N.D. Cal. Cases “Could Have Been Brought” In New Jersey**

9 An action could have been brought in any court that has subject matter jurisdiction over
 10 the claims and personal jurisdiction over the defendant, and where venue is proper. *See Hoffman*
 11 *v. Blaski*, 363 U.S. 335, 343-44 (1960). This threshold factor is easily satisfied for New Jersey,
 12 although the same is not true in this District.

13 **First**, for the same reason this Court has subject matter jurisdiction, the District of New
 14 Jersey has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C.
 15 1332(d)(2), because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 and minimal diversity exists.
 16 *See, e.g., Gulkarov*, ECF No. 15 at ¶ 21.

17 **Second**, Campbell and Plum are properly subject to general personal jurisdiction in New
 18 Jersey because, at the time of filing the complaints, both entities maintained their principal places
 19 of business in Camden, New Jersey.⁶ *See Daimler AG v. Bauman*, 571 U.S. 117, 137-38 (2014).

20 ⁵ Plum anticipates that plaintiffs will argue that instead of transferring these cases to New Jersey,
 21 the District of New Jersey actions should instead be transferred here based on the first-to-file rule
 22 because *Gulkarov* was the first case (measured by a matter of days) filed against Plum. But there
 23 are two problems with that position. First, the New Jersey cases could not have been brought in
 24 the Northern District of California and thus transfer to this District would be improper. Second,
 25 the first-to-file rule is not dispositive because “[a] court may, in its discretion, decline to apply
 26 the first-to-file rule in the interests of equity or where the Section 1404(a) balance of
 27 convenience weighs in favor of the later-filed action.” *Wallerstein v. Dole Fresh Vegetables, Inc.*, 967 F. Supp. 2d 1289, 1293 (N.D. Cal. 2013). Here, as discussed *infra*, because the balance
 28 of convenience factors overwhelmingly weigh in favor of transfer, the Court should decline to
 give any significant weight to the jurisdiction of the first-filed case based on the first-to-file rule.

6 In contrast, there is no general jurisdiction over either Plum or Campbell in California. *See Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown*, 564 U.S. 915, 919 (2011). Plum anticipates that plaintiffs will argue that the Court should disregard the actual physical location of Plum’s principal place of business in favor of an erroneous filing with the California Secretary of State, mistakenly insinuating that Plum’s principal place of business was in California long after it had

1 **Third**, venue is proper in a district where “any defendant resides, if all defendants are
 2 residents of the State.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). A corporation is deemed to reside in any district
 3 in which it is subject to personal jurisdiction at the time that the action is commenced. 28 U.S.C.
 4 § 1391(c). Both Plum and Campbell are subject to personal jurisdiction in the District of New
 5 Jersey because their principal places of business are in Camden, New Jersey. Accordingly, venue
 6 of the N.D. Cal. Cases is appropriate in the District of New Jersey. To the contrary, venue is
 7 improper in the Northern District of California as to any case brought by a non-California
 8 plaintiff or any California plaintiff who did not purchase the challenged products in the Northern
 9 District of California.

10 **B. Convenience And Fairness Factors Weigh In Favor Of Transfer**

11 The convenience of the parties and witnesses also favors transfer. “In balancing the
 12 convenience of the witnesses, courts give primary consideration to non-party witnesses, as
 13 opposed to witnesses who are employees of a party to the litigation.” *SA Music, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,
 14 2020 WL 8028613, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020) (citation omitted). “[T]he court must
 15 consider not simply how many witnesses each side has and the location of each, but, rather, the
 16 court must consider the importance of the witnesses.” *Knoll, Inc. v. Modway, Inc.*, 2020 WL
 17 6784346, at *4 (Nov. 17, 2020 C.D. Cal.) (citation omitted); *Metz v. U.S. Life Ins. Co. in City of*
 18 *New York*, 674 F. Supp. 2d 1141, 1147 (C.D. Cal. 2009). Litigating in the district where
 19 Campbell and Plum’s headquarters are located is more convenient for Campbell and Plum, the
 20 sole defendants in this case. Defendants and their employees, witnesses, and evidence are located
 21 in New Jersey. There is no evidence regarding Campbell and Plum, or the labeling and
 22 advertising at issue, located in California. Accordingly, the District of New Jersey is the most
 23 convenient forum for witnesses. Plaintiffs themselves are citizens of at least seven different
 24 states, including East Coast states such as Pennsylvania, Florida, Kentucky, and New York.
 25 Traveling to the District of New Jersey will be far less burdensome for many plaintiffs than
 26 travel to the Northern District of California. Moreover, even though some plaintiffs are

27
 28 moved to New Jersey. Stewart Decl. ¶ 6. But a company’s principal place of business is where it
 actually is, not where an erroneous piece of paper might say it is.

1 California citizens, they will not have nearly as significant a role as Campbell and Plum and their
 2 respective employees in discovery and any trial. As one California court explained in a similar
 3 case, “the gravamen of the Complaint is the falsity of the claims on the package, which would
 4 not be a subject of Plaintiff[]s[’] testimony.” *Jovel v. i-Health, Inc.*, 2012 WL 5470057, at *3
 5 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2012).

6 Additionally, litigating all of the cases against Campbell and Plum in one venue would
 7 avoid inherent inconvenience associated with defending against the same or similar claims
 8 thousands of miles apart. *See Alexander v. Franklin Res., Inc.*, 2007 WL 518859, at *3 (N. D.
 9 Cal. Feb. 14, 2007) (“appearing in a single district is more convenient than appearing in two
 10 different districts on opposite coasts of the country”); *Fraser v. Genesco, Inc.*, 2011 WL
 11 4566312, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2011) (finding transfer would be convenient for the parties
 12 and witnesses because “the potential consolidation of these actions in a single district would
 13 prevent all persons involved from having to travel to multiple venues . . . to litigate substantially
 14 similar, if not identical, claims”).

15 Moreover, and as one court put it in its decision granting a 1404(a) transfer motion
 16 sending a baby food false advertising class action from California to New Jersey under a
 17 materially similar procedural and factual record:

18 the Court cannot simply weigh the benefits and costs of California versus
 19 New Jersey as the forum for Plaintiff’s case; instead, the question is
 20 whether this suit should be consolidated with *In re Gerber* in New Jersey,
 21 or whether it should proceed simultaneously – and separately – in
 22 California.

23 *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1213; *see also Burns*, 922 F. Supp. 2d at 1170-71 (same). Here, it’s
 24 not a close call and the convenience factors weigh heavily in support of transfer.

25 Finally, because the alleged conduct underlying this case emanated from New Jersey, and
 26 New Jersey has as much interest in regulating the conduct of one of its corporations as California
 27 does in protecting its residents, transfer is appropriate. *See In R.A. v. Epic Games, Inc.*, 2019 WL
 28 6792801, at *10, n.4 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2019).

1 C. Transfer Would Serve The Interests Of Justice

2 Transferring the N.D. Cal. Cases to the New Jersey would serve the interests of justice
 3 because multiple, similar cases are currently pending there. *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1214
 4 (“five similar cases against Defendants have already been consolidated and are currently pending
 5 in the District of New Jersey”). The “interests of justice” inquiry, “which includes
 6 [considerations of] judicial economy, may be determinative to a particular transfer motion.” *Puri*
 7 *v. Hearthside Food Sols, LLC*, 2011 WL 6257182, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2011). “The
 8 pendency of related actions in the transferee forum is a significant factor in considering the
 9 interest of justice factor” because transfer would “facilitate[] efficient, economical and
 10 expeditious pre-trial proceedings and discovery and avoid duplicitous litigation and inconsistent
 11 results.” *Id.* at *3 (citations omitted); *Sugarman v. Muddy Waters Cap. LLC*, 2021 WL 583220,
 12 at *8 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2021) (“[F]easibility of consolidation . . . has been held to weigh in
 13 favor of transfer where a related action is pending in the proposed transferee court and such
 14 transfer would avoid ‘duplicitous litigation and inconsistent results.’”) (citation omitted).

15 In addition to judicial economy, courts may consider other factors including “(1) the
 16 plaintiff’s choice of forum, (2) the respective parties’ contacts with the forum, (3) the contacts
 17 relating to the plaintiff’s cause of action in the chosen forum, (4) the differences in the costs of
 18 litigation in the two forums, (5) the availability of compulsory process to compel attendance of
 19 unwilling non-party witnesses, (6) the ease of access to sources of proof, and (7) the state that is
 20 most familiar with the governing law.” *Knoll*, 2020 WL 6784346, at *2 (*citing Jones v. GNC*
 21 *Franchising, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498–99 (9th Cir. 2000)) (citations omitted); *Walters v. Famous*
 22 *Transports, Inc.*, 488 F. Supp. 3d 930, 936 (N.D. Cal. 2020). “No single factor is dispositive, and
 23 a district court has broad discretion to adjudicate motions for transfer on a case-by-case basis.”
 24 *Apple*, 2020 WL 8028613, at *4.

25 **Judicial Economy.** The N.D. Cal. Cases assert materially identical claims, and on behalf
 26 of identical national classes and substantially similar sub-classes, as the four cases currently
 27 pending in the District of New Jersey. Transfer to the District of New Jersey will thus conserve
 28

1 judicial resources, avoid duplicative discovery, and remove the potential for inconsistent
 2 determinations on the same or similar issues. As stated in *Hawkins*:

3 The Court finds that the transfer of this action to the District of New
 4 Jersey would serve the interest of justice due to the possible consolidation
 5 of discovery and the conservation of time, energy and money, and the
 6 avoidance of the possibility of inconsistent judgments.

7 *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1214.

8 Indeed, “[t]o permit a situation in which two cases involving precisely the same issues
 9 are simultaneously pending in different District Courts leads to the wastefulness of time, energy
 10 and money that § 1404(a) was designed to prevent.” *Puri*, 2011 WL 6257182, at *3; *Alexander*,
 11 *Inc.*, 2007 WL 518859, at *3; *Fraser*, 2011 WL 4566312, at *3. Judicial economy strongly
 12 weighs in favor of transfer to New Jersey.

13 ***Plaintiffs’ Choice of Forum Is Not Entitled To Deference.*** Although courts typically
 14 afford some deference to a plaintiff’s choice of forum, because plaintiffs here brought these
 15 cases as nationwide class actions on behalf of all Plum consumers, their choice of forum is
 16 entitled to minimum deference. *See Lou v. Belzberg*, 834 F.2d 730, 739 (9th Cir. 1987)
 17 (“[W]hen an individual . . . represents a class, the named plaintiff’s choice of forum is given less
 18 weight”); *Koster v. (Am.) Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co.*, 330 U.S. 518, 524 (1947) (“[W]here there
 19 are hundreds of potential plaintiffs . . . all of whom could with equal show of right go into their
 20 many home courts, the claim of any one plaintiff that a forum is appropriate merely because it is
 21 his home forum is considerably weakened.”); *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1214-15 (“reduced
 22 weight on plaintiff’s choice of forum in class actions”).

23 Finally, plaintiffs’ choice of forum in the Northern District of California was based on the
 24 mistaken belief that Plum was located in this judicial district. *See* n.6. Because Plum and
 25 Campbell are not subject to general jurisdiction in California, this Court lacks personal
 26 jurisdiction over them with respect to the claims of the non-California named plaintiffs. *See*
 27 *Daimler AG*, 571 U.S. at 137; *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Sup. Ct.*, 137 S. Ct 1773, 1781
 28 (2017); *Walden v. Fiore*, 571 U.S. 277, 286 (2014); *see also*, e.g., *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at

1 1215 (“if the transactions giving rise to the action lack a significant connection to the plaintiff’s
 2 chosen forum, the plaintiff’s choice of forum is given considerably less weight”). Consequently,
 3 the Court owes little, if any, deference to these plaintiffs’ choice of forum. *See Benjamin v.*
 4 *Bixby*, 2009 WL 2171781, at *8 (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2009) (where “the Court has found that
 5 venue is not appropriate in the Eastern District of California . . .[,] Plaintiffs’ choice of venue is
 6 not afforded deference”).

7 ***Familiarity With Governing Law.*** While this Court may be more familiar with the
 8 California claims brought by certain plaintiffs, the N.D. Cal. Cases consist of claims brought
 9 under the laws of multiple states including New York, Florida, Kentucky, and Minnesota, with
 10 which the New Jersey Court would likely be at least equally familiar. What is more, “other
 11 federal courts are fully capable of applying California law” and routinely do so. *See Wallace v.*
 12 *Int’l Paper Co.*, 2020 WL 4938361, at *7 (C.D. Cal. July 2, 2020).

13 ***The Parties’ Contacts With The Forum Relating To The Causes Of Action.*** Defendants
 14 have little to no relevant contacts with this forum because they are headquartered and maintain
 15 principal places of business in Camden, New Jersey. Thus, the alleged decision making and
 16 conduct relating to the alleged false advertising, and the related evidence, sits outside of this
 17 venue. *See Alesia v. Gojo Industries, Inc.*, 2020 WL 6826475, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2020)
 18 (granting motion to transfer because “[t]he conduct giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims [was] more
 19 closely tied to the” transferee district); *Hawkins*, 924 F. Supp. 2d at 1215 (Court agrees “that ‘in
 20 a false advertising action, the heart of the matter lies where the marketing and manufacturing
 21 decisions were made, which is typically at Defendant’s headquarters.’”); *Burns*, 922 F. Supp. 2d
 22 at 1171 (same).

23 In *Alesia*, the plaintiffs’ claims arose “out of Defendant’s marketing and advertising
 24 strategies – conduct that originated and occurred” at the defendant’s headquarters. 2020 WL
 25 6826475, at *2. The fact that the plaintiffs purchased the product at issue in the transferor district
 26 did “not outweigh the fact” that all of the alleged misconduct took place outside the transferor
 27 district. *Id.* (citing *In re Yahoo! Inc.*, 2008 WL 707405, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2008) (“this
 28 case turns on the allegedly false public statements and the decisions made by Yahoo!’s senior

1 management, which indisputably occurred at Yahoo!'s headquarters. Because Yahoo!'s
 2 headquarters is the 'factual center of this case, and the locus of all relevant decisionmaking,'
 3 plaintiffs' claims have stronger contacts with the Northern District.")) (citations omitted).

4 The same is true here. As in *Alesia, Hawkins and Burns*, the alleged conduct relevant to
 5 plaintiffs' claims (mislabeling of baby food) occurred, if at all, at Defendants' headquarters. As
 6 such, this factor too weighs in favor of transfer.

7 ***Cost of Litigating, Ease of Access to Proof, and the Availability of Compulsory Process.***
 8 There is no reason to believe that the cost of litigating would not be similar between this Court
 9 and the District of New Jersey. *Cf. Alesia*, 2020 WL 6826475, at *2 ("The Court has no data on
 10 the difference in the costs of litigating in the two fora, particularly in light of the COVID-19
 11 pandemic, and considers this factor to be neutral."). However, the cost of accessing proof and
 12 witnesses is likely to be more substantial *absent* transfer. As discussed above, many of the key
 13 witnesses and proof are more conveniently accessible from the District of New Jersey. Accessing
 14 those witnesses and proof from local districts is more convenient and less costly. For example,
 15 several of Campbell's former employees and third parties who have relevant information remain
 16 within the subpoena power of the District of New Jersey. To the extent compulsory process were
 17 required to secure their testimony, such process would be available from that district. As such,
 18 these factors weigh in favor of transfer.

19 **IV. CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully requests that the Court transfer the
 21 N.D. Cal. Cases to the District of New Jersey.

22 Dated: April 12, 2021

MAYER BROWN LLP
 Dale J. Giali
 Keri E. Borders

23

DECHERT LLP
 Hope Friewald (*pro hac vice* to be filed)
 Mark Cheffo (*pro hac vice* to be filed)

24

by: /s/ Keri E. Borders
 Keri E. Borders
 Attorneys for Defendants
 PLUM, PBC and
 CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY

25

26

27

28